

**Upending Racism in Psychological Science: Strategies to Change How Our Science is Conducted,  
Reported, Reviewed & Disseminated**

NiCole T. Buchanan<sup>1</sup>, Marisol Perez<sup>2</sup>, Mitchell J. Prinstein<sup>3</sup>, and Idia B. Thurston<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Michigan State University

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Arizona State University

<sup>3</sup>Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

<sup>4</sup>Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences; Department of Health Promotion and Community  
Health Sciences, Texas A&M University

Author Note

NiCole T. Buchanan (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9288-5245>), Marisol Perez (<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0915-2145>), Mitchell J. Prinstein (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7587-8665>), and Idia B. Thurston (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2484-2985>).

We have no known conflicts of interest to disclose.

Authorship is alphabetical by last name, we are all first authors and contributed equally to this manuscript. Note that the current system used to acknowledge authorship credit reflects a linear hierarchical structure that may better fit for Whites and males (who created this practice) rather than contributions among diverse collaborators who publish today. When this manuscript was drafted, one author self-identified as a U.S. born biracial Black woman, one author self-identified as a Hispanic woman, one author self-identified as a White male, and one author self-identified as a Black Woman U.S. American Immigrant. Correspondence regarding this manuscript may be directed to Dr. Idia Thurston, Texas A&M University, 256 Psychology Building, College Station, TX 77843, [idiathurston@tamu.edu](mailto:idiathurston@tamu.edu), 979-845-3794

### **Abstract**

As efforts to end systemic racism gain momentum across various contexts, it is critical to consider anti-racist steps that will be required to improve psychological science. Current scientific practices serve to maintain white supremacy with significant and impactful consequences. Extant research practices reinforce norms of homogeneity within BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color) populations, segregate theories and methods derived from BIPOC groups, apply disparate standards to the evaluation of research on White vs. BIPOC populations, and discourage BIPOC scholars from pursuing research careers. Perhaps consequently, mental and physical health disparities remain largely unimproved. In this article we present examples of how epistemic oppression exists within psychological science, including how science is conducted, reported, reviewed, and disseminated. Specific recommendations are offered for many stakeholders, including those involved in the production, reporting, and gatekeeping of science as well as consumers of science. Additionally, we present a diversity accountability index for journals with potential benchmarks for measuring progress as one strategy to promote dialogue and action, challenge inequity, and upend the influence of white supremacy in psychological science.

**Keywords:** racism, psychological science, epistemic, recommendation, research dissemination

**Public Health Statement:** Changing systemic racism requires multi-systemic change. In this paper we identify several systems and stakeholders requiring reform to eliminate white supremacy in psychological science.

Upending Racism in Psychological Science: Strategies to Change How Our Science is Conducted,  
Reported, Reviewed & Disseminated

Recent national attention to historical and contemporary racism, spurred by the killings of Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, and countless Black community members in the United States (Proctor, 2020) have spurred critical examination of the role of systemic racism in all sectors of society. Racism often is defined at the individual level as psychological processes that contribute to stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination (Salter, Adams, & Perez, 2018). However, focusing on individual-level factors can mask how cultural and institutional processes contribute to racism and maintain white supremacy<sup>1</sup> (Salter et al., 2018). Changing systemic racism requires multi-systemic change. In this paper we identify several systems and stakeholders requiring reform to eliminate white supremacy in psychological science.

Epistemic oppression (i.e., systematic exclusion that hinders contribution to knowledge production and advancement; Dotson, 2012) within psychological science limits and potentially flaws research (Settles, Warner et al., 2020). Psychological research fails to incorporate or demonstrate adequate generality to BIPOC populations, and relies predominantly on theoretical models developed by White scholars for White populations. As a consequence, science has failed to substantially reduce physical or mental health disparities across racial/ethnic groups (see Baker et al., 2010; Buchanan & Wiklund, 2020a). Moreover, BIPOC populations remain significantly underrepresented among journal editors, associate editors, and reviewers, and psychological studies that address race are often conducted by White researchers using primarily White samples (and smaller proportions of BIPOC participants) compared to the work of BIPOC scholars (Roberts et al., 2020). Furthermore, research conducted by BIPOC scholars, or on predominantly BIPOC samples, is segregated to “specialty journals,”

---

<sup>1</sup> We have intentionally used lower case to refer to the construct of “white supremacy,” because the capitalization of the word “white” when not used solely to label a racial/ethnic group (e.g., “White” “Black”) may in itself be an example of white supremacy (see <https://www.cjr.org/analysis/capital-b-black-styleguide.php> for more information).

while research on predominantly White populations is published in higher impact outlets. These markers, and many more, reveal that psychological science reflects a systemic pattern of white supremacy.

Change in psychological science requires all stakeholders to accept responsibility and commit to action. In this paper, we offer specific recommendations (see Table 1) to dismantle white supremacy in how psychological science is conducted, reported, reviewed and disseminated that are applicable to authors, educators, journal editors/publishers, and reviewers. We also introduce the *Diversity Accountability Index - Journals (DAI-J)*; see Table 2) that journal editors and publishers can use to establish benchmarks, monitor progress, and report publicly to document their commitment to change.

### **How Science is Conducted**

Current conduct within psychological science reflects systemic racism and maintains white supremacy. Research focusing on BIPOC populations is disproportionately rare, and studies that do examine BIPOC communities often require a White comparison group in order to be published, particularly in higher impact journals. Notably, this same standard (i.e., requiring BIPOC comparison groups) is not applied to studies of predominantly White populations. Current research also utilizes recruitment and hypothesis-generation approaches that reflect predominantly White convenience samples and draw from theoretical frameworks and theories that have been developed by White scholars to the exclusion of BIPOC scholars. These realities change how research is conducted and analyzed, permitting substantive examination of White within-group differences while precluding the examination of BIPOC within-group differences. Furthermore, such practices prioritize conducting research with, by, and for White people, which reinforces whiteness as a normative default and communicates that BIPOC people are atypical, less important to study, and less valuable relative to others. We assert that upending racism in psychological science requires several changes to the ways in which research is conducted.

**1. Conduct and publish more research on race.** The paucity of research on BIPOC communities, particularly in “mainstream” (i.e., higher impact) journals, directly affects citation metrics of scholars who study these topics, and the impact of relevant papers. Thus, the lack of papers on BIPOC communities becomes a self-perpetuating issue in the field. Scholars who focus on BIPOC populations and BIPOC-related topics are less frequently included in the manuscript review processes within mainstream outlets, and thus submissions to these higher impact outlets continue to be evaluated predominantly by White scholars. Scholars studying BIPOC populations subsequently are less likely to be hired or promoted at “top-tier” universities that value citation indices, and less likely to recruit scholars who will pursue research careers, thus maintaining a major gap in the field.

These are high priority issues for change (Roberts et al., 2020). The exclusion of BIPOC scholarship and the interpretation of findings in ways that harm BIPOC communities are non-neutral acts of epistemic violence and oppression (Dotson, 2012, 2014; Teo 2008, 2018) with harmful consequences not only to BIPOC communities, but also to the future of psychological science and its societal impact (Buchanan & Wiklund, 2020a; Osbeck, 2018). We recommend that journals seek out publications on BIPOC populations by encouraging special issues that raise awareness about these issues (e.g., see Valrie, Thurston, & Santos, 2020). Journals should champion publications on BIPOC samples, support scholarship on topics relevant to BIPOC communities, and report improvements over time for accountability (i.e., see suggested benchmarks in Table 2). After establishing baseline data on the representation of these topics and samples, each journal should establish benchmarks to ensure yearly increase in the number of publications on these critical topics (see table 2).

**2. Exemplify values regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion.** The production of science is substantially influenced by journal and funding agency priorities. Thus journals and editorial staff must move beyond diversity statements that express solidarity with BIPOC scholars or simply state that Black Lives Matter and instead *show* they value scholarship that benefits BIPOC communities and scholars. It is

recommended that journals showcase studies and call for papers that center *all* of the experiences of BIPOC communities. This means publishing balanced stories of the full experiences of Black and Brown people, not only publishing negative outcomes, and across papers, ensuring a full spectrum of the population is represented (e.g., not only low-income members of a group). Journal mission statements should include language that reflects values related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, in science, highlight a desire for more research on within-group differences within various BIPOC populations (i.e., perhaps through calls for special sections/issues), showcase these papers when they are published (e.g., see Springer Nature (<https://www.springernature.com/gp/researchers/campaigns/black-lives-matter>) for an example), and promote the visibility of these scholars and their work. This could be done by requiring author positionality statements regarding social identity (see acknowledgment section of this paper) and including author pictures (see American Psychologist for an example). These measures would serve as informational and visual representations of diversity and inclusion. Relatedly, journals should consider how limits on the number of references result in reduced citations of BIPOC scholars in favor of citing mainstream papers and authors. Journals should invest in training and educating their editorial staff to recognize the added value of publishing BIPOC-focused manuscripts and highlight this expectation when inviting editorial board members and reviewers to serve.

**3. Use research methods most appropriate for BIPOC populations.** Methods used to recruit and examine questions among White populations have been reinforced in the field. Community-based participatory research (CBPR) principles (Israel et al., 2010) offer a complementary approach that leads to research theories and methods (i.e., measures, paradigms) to better reflect BIPOC individuals and their lived experiences, address health disparities, and adds novel contributions to the research literature. Further, quantitative approaches such as person-centered (as compared to variable-centered) analyses (Howard & Hoffman, 2018) could be championed by journals as these techniques may better capture heterogeneity within diverse populations. Graduate student research training should include

understanding of CBPR approaches that encourage greater representation of BIPOC communities.

Moreover, journals should unequivocally indicate that they value CBPR principles and encourage more research using these approaches.

**4. Encourage the recruitment of more diverse samples.** Diverse samples are encouraged, but predominantly White samples remain the norm with few papers rejected for this reason. Papers on predominantly White samples typically are published without caveats in the title, perpetuating a whiteness norm. In contrast, studies on predominantly BIPOC samples often are required to indicate so in the manuscript title and reviewers are more likely to require a discussion of generality limitations when such research is published. These practices affect how science is conducted, allowing researchers with White samples to ignore the need to diversify their samples and compelling those working with BIPOC samples to recruit a White comparison group, even when there is no scientifically-driven reason to do so. This creates an undue burden on the research resources for BIPOC-focused research and scholars. Investigators should consider innovative solutions to diversifying their samples while partnering in ways that balance power dynamics and strengths of the team, such as collaborations between academicians at predominantly White institutions (PWIs), where research resources tend to be higher, and academicians at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), where diverse college populations tend to be higher. Similarly, investigators should seek out collaborations with community colleges (which tend to have more diverse student populations) to create more diverse subject pool participation, and establish community partnerships with BIPOC organizations in ways that can increase trust and participation in research studies. Journals can stimulate changes in how investigators collect data by explicitly stating minimum requirements for sample diversity in papers that claim to represent the general population. Journals can also instruct authors to discuss and justify their use of WEIRD samples (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic; Henrich et al., 2016) versus BIPOC samples. Journals should require that manuscripts with

WEIRD samples indicate so within paper titles, and that all reviewers assess concerns regarding inclusion (i.e., as is required in federal grant reviews) to prompt investigators to be cognizant of addressing these issues when conducting research. Such requirements should reduce perpetuation of systemic racism given that requiring sample characteristics for BIPOC studies to be indicated in paper titles leads to a reduction in manuscript citations because consumers of science (i.e., mostly White individuals) might assume that such manuscripts are not relevant to the broader (i.e., White dominated) literature. These recommended practices may increase submissions from BIPOC authors, encourage BIPOC reviewers to offer expertise, and reduce discriminatory statements within reviews (Neblett, 2019).

**5. Promote diversity science research approaches.** Journals should encourage research that integrates a diversity science approach. Diversity Science is a field with a rich history and expansive application to all psychological science (Miller et al., 2019). Defined as “the study of the interpretation and construction of human difference—of why and how difference makes a difference--within the context of existing, historically shaped cultural and structural realities” (Plaut, 2010b, p. 168), diversity science refers to a set of practices for conceptualizing, conducting and reporting science. A diversity science approach moves away from prioritizing generality and focuses instead on identifying where differences exist and the sociocultural forces that lead to and reinforce those differences (Plaut, 2010a). Diversity science research on race and racism can expand theory-informed research and evidence-based practice (Miller et al., 2019; Hall et al., 2016). More broadly, diversity science provides methodological frameworks for improving psychological science and ensuring that it addresses the needs of a diverse global population. To achieve these aims, scholars must learn about and incorporate diversity science theories and approaches, such as intersectionality theory, minority stress theory, and critical race studies, that center research within understandings of oppression and inequality (Plaut, 2010a; 2010b). As a consequence, the introduction and discussion sections of manuscripts should illustrate how research questions and findings identify and illuminate systemic oppression, consider patterns of historical oppression and

inequality, acknowledge the ways in which scientific knowledge has historically been used to benefit the privileged while simultaneously harming others; and centering study implications from an inequality and social justice lens (Buchanan & Wiklund, 2020a; Cole, 2009; Miller et al., 2019; Rosenthal, 2016). It is recommended that journal mission statements include language regarding a diversity science approach. Additionally, journals should expand submission classifications to include diversity science as a primary manuscript type to allow for culturally-informed consideration.

### **How Science is Reported**

The language we use as academicians, writers, clinicians, editors, and publishers matters. Words contribute to the maintenance of white supremacy by uplifting some while denigrating others. Labels can intentionally or unintentionally convey that one group is inherently inferior, or attribute blame to one's race rather than systems of inequity that have been inflicted upon (or power that has been taken away from) a racial group. The language used in psychological science often perpetuates negative stereotypes of BIPOC individuals and inadequately describes BIPOC samples and the contexts in which BIPOC identities are assessed. Upending racism in psychological science requires changes in how we report findings and using language that is more diverse, equitable, and inclusive.

**6. Require the use of system centered language.** Today, many BIPOC people in the US live in lower income neighborhoods because operational structures and systems have disadvantaged these individuals. Yet, research often discusses risk factors attributed to an ethnic group itself, rather than the conditions that members of this group have disproportionately experienced, or been unfairly disadvantaged by. Systems centered language (O'Reilly, 2020) includes a discussion of the current policies and historical roots that maintain health inequity, and the use of this language can promote a process of actively challenging narratives that have shaped how our society views and treats BIPOC individuals. System centered language offers a paradigm shift for how we use language to describe BIPOC and other minoritized communities and is akin to person first language, where the person is put

before the diagnosis (e.g., obese person vs. person with obesity) to humanize the individual and show that the disease is but one aspect of their life. A similar model is proposed in systems centered language, such that the intergenerational systems that drive oppression and racism are held accountable and labelled appropriately so that the humanity of the individuals who are impacted by these systems are upheld. Using systems centered language will allow readers and authors to maintain conscious awareness that disparities are due to inadequate structures and processes rather than individual weaknesses. For example, instead of writing “BIPOC communities are *vulnerable* populations in the United States”, write “BIPOC are among the *most prohibited* populations in the United States.” Instead of writing “People living in poverty are *at risk* for poor health outcomes”, write “People living in poverty are *exposed to additional harms* that drive poorer health outcomes” (see O’Reilly, 2020 for details). Similarly, when outcomes are presented (e.g., health disparities) and existing research is reviewed, findings should be couched within the systemic structures that maintain disparate outcomes. For example when discussing negative health outcomes among Black populations, explain that these outcomes are due to systemic racism and discrimination, rather than stopping at the outcome. Journals should update author guidelines to require the use of systems centered language in all submissions, and publicly report adherence (see Table 2). Submission portals should require that authors attest to whether they used systems centered language. Systems centered language also should be required in the next revision of the APA Publication Manual (APA, 2020).

**7. Update journal keywords to be more inclusive.** Journal submission portals communicate messages about the types of research that are valued. Many journals have established lists of keywords that fail to include categories related to diversity, equity, and inclusion<sup>2</sup>. These omissions communicate the (lack of) value the journal places on these topics. Journals can correct this messaging by increasing the pool of

---

<sup>2</sup> Examples include racial justice, racism, intersectionality theory, oppression, minority stress, sexism, structural inequality, cultural humility, implicit bias, discrimination, ethnic identity, racial identity, health equity, diversity, and inclusion.

inclusive keywords, keep these keywords up to date to stay current with the evolving language used in diversity science (e.g., BIPOC), include an “other” field to allow for keywords that are not currently offered and that uplift (e.g., systems centered language), rather than denigrate individuals (see #7 above), and report publications using these keywords for accountability (see Table 2). We encourage authors to use specific and relevant keywords to describe the nuances in their diversity science research as a way to educate editors, reviewers, and the field.

**8. Define race and ethnicity contextually and conceptually.** Race is not biological, it is a political and social construct that often serves as a proxy for the impact of racist practices and structural inequality (Helms, 2020; Roberts, 2011; Smedley & Smedley, 2005). Accordingly, when reporting on race, authors need to acknowledge the sociopolitical nature of the construct within text or as a footnote so that readers are clear on the positionality of the author(s) in their examination of this construct. For example, in our own work, one author (IBT) explicitly notes in manuscripts: “Race is a political and social construct that often serves as a proxy for the impact of racist practices and structural inequality, it is not a biological variable and thus is examined in the current paper with this premise in mind.”

**9. Require reporting of ethnicity for all participants.** Ethnicity refers to shared cultural heritage that distinguishes one group of people from another including ancestry, a sense of history, language, religion, foods, and clothing. The practice of ignoring ethnicity for most participants or reporting ethnicity for only one ethnic group maintains and upholds white supremacist practices in science. Ethnicity should be assessed for all participants and reflect the richness of ethnicities within groups (e.g., Hmong, Nigerian, Japanese, Ashkenazi Jews, Eastern European) rather than binaries such as Hispanic/non-Hispanic. Authors also should label how ethnicity (and race) were determined (e.g., participants self-identified as Black or participants were Latinx-identified in their medical records) to help readers understand potential biases in how these data are reported. Further, it is critical to emphasize that ethnic categories are dynamic (not static concepts) which vary as a function of context, place, and time (see Ford &

Harawa, 2010). Indeed, despite calls to, at a minimum, report and consider finer differentiation within BIPOC groups (Buchanan & Wiklund, 2020a; Hall et al., 2016), 73% of psychology papers across 11 journals did not provide *any* data on the race or ethnicity of their participants (DeJesus, et al., 2019), while studies that do so rarely recognize important cultural differences (e.g., not all Black people are African-American; Indigenous people include members of specific tribes, and may or may not live on reservations). The APA Publication Manual (APA, 2020) should require the reporting of races for all participants, and ethnicities for all races, and require that the generality of findings is addressed in all discussion sections.

**10. Report heterogeneity *within* BIPOC populations.** Intersections among race/ethnicity, gender, and social class, shape lived experiences and the generality of study findings, as such, reporting detailed participant demographics is essential for meeting baseline standards of good science (Buchanan & Wiklund, 2020b). It is critical that demographic information be reported such that intersecting identities are easily identified, moving beyond tallies across gender and separately across race to identify the number of individuals within each category (e.g., Black women, Asian men, etc) and examine if findings are similar across these groups. It is recommended that heterogeneity is reported and considered analytically as appropriate (see Suyemoto et al., 2016 for an example of a detailed demographic questionnaire).

### **How Science is Reviewed**

Racism and white supremacy are endemic throughout the process of scientific review of psychology research. All players within the scientific review process (i.e., authors, reviewers, editors, and publishers) need to deepen their understanding of the many ways that assumptions of white supremacy are maintained and systemic racism is proliferated. Biases in the peer-review process are frequently ignored, yet are prevalent and have significant impacts on publication (Lee et al., 2013; Mahoney, 1977; Stanley, 2007). Despite masked review, these biases disproportionately affect BIPOC

scholars and research relevant to BIPOC communities in publication and grant reviews. For example, over 20% of the NIH funding disparities for Black scholars are related to their topical foci, such as health disparities, even after controlling for other relevant variables (Hoppe et al., 2019). Similar biases exist across psychological science, where the topics most relevant to BIPOC scholars are devalued in psychology journals and deemed less worthy of publication (Diaz & Bergman, 2013; Roberts et al., 2020). Specifically, reviewers evidence bias in the standards required of BIPOC scholarship (e.g., demanding White comparison groups for BIPOC studies, but not requiring BIPOC comparisons for primarily White samples), the theoretical frameworks often used for such scholarship (Settles, Warner et al., 2020), the values deemed inherent to psychological science, such as researcher neutrality (Osbeck, 2018), and the methods used in BIPOC-focused research, such as CBPR or qualitative methods (Lee et al., 2013).

Addressing these patterns requires confrontation of existing power dynamics in psychological science that contribute to the (in)visibility of some scholars and scholarship over others (Buchanan & Settles, 2019; Settles, Warner et al., 2020). Editors have power to determine what will be published, senior scholars have power over junior scholars (i.e., given a greater likelihood of serving as reviewers and having their comments more heavily weighted), and professional society leaders' have power to select journal editors and define journal foci. In each case, White investigators hold power over BIPOC scholars given that the scientific review process was created by Whites and implicitly sustains white privilege. Without acknowledging the power disparities undergirding scientific research and publishing, proposed solutions will be ineffective in ending white supremacy in psychological science. As such, we propose several changes to dismantle racism and white supremacy in the scientific review process.

**11. Establish *systems* to examine inequities in reviews and their impact on BIPOC research.** As the field adopts a new culture, language, and awareness of its complicity in maintaining white supremacy, all parties will need to vigilantly monitor processes that can create inequalities in psychological science.

Editors and publishers have considerable power in establishing and enforcing standards in the field and need to be mindful that progress is independent of individual priorities which can change when editorial leadership changes. To create systemic change, processes and systems must be put in place that supersede the individuals involved and actively monitor ways that the publication process facilitates bias in research. For example, the *diversity accountability index* (see Table 2) provides a format to encode baseline data on a journal's current practices, identify deficits to be remediated, and define areas where improvement is possible. From there, publishers can identify benchmarks toward their goals, commit to reviewing their progress annually, and report progress on these goals publicly. Such processes have the added benefit of potentially highlighting unknown problems. For example, discovering differences in the outcomes of papers with BIPOC foci may reveal systematic differences in how those papers are reviewed, and invite novel solutions (see suggestions below). Similarly, establishing systems to recognize and protocols for responding to biased reviewer comments, allows editors to give feedback to reviewers and an opportunity to revise reviews *before* sending them to authors (Sue & Torino, 2005). This halts the perpetuation of bias that BIPOC scholars may experience during the review process and the editors' complicity in such bias by presenting these comments as part of their review process.

**12. Implement changes at the top that address *ongoing* racism in the review process.** Ongoing patterns of systemic racism can affect the trajectory of entire scientific disciplines. We recommend that publishing outlets, and the societies/professional associations that sponsor journals, create and maintain a process (e.g., an ombudsperson, an anonymous reporting avenue) that would allow scholars to report practices that maintain epistemic oppression. Moreover, it is recommended that professional societies examine existing journal and divisional leadership and move toward developing new procedures that promote equitable practices. Specifically, professional societies and review committees should evaluate editor candidates based on their track records of dismantling white supremacy,

evaluate candidates' ability to move the journal toward a more equitable review process, and require a diversity statement in their application package - one that explicitly outlines how they will increase BIPOC presence in authorship, editorial membership, and content and how they have handled issues of racism in the past. Publishers can evaluate journals and provide incentives through metrics such as those in Table 2, and might also consider developing policies that enforce sanctions for ongoing racism in the review process.

**13. Create a system for authors to rate reviews and reviewers.** Racism in the editorial review process is rampant; yet there are no formal mechanisms for authors to give feedback when reviews reflect biased or racist assumptions. For example, one co-author (MP) regularly receives comments such as “One of the weaknesses of the study is the inclusion of only English-speaking Hispanics/Latinx which significantly limits the generalizability to a small proportion of Hispanics/Latinx in the U.S.” This statement problematically relies on the stereotype that the majority of Hispanics/Latinx in the U.S. do not speak English.<sup>3</sup> A formal feedback system would allow authors to bring such biased statements to the attention of the editorial team. It is important for authors not only to have the opportunity to report when reviewers or action editors offer racist and offensive comments, but to evaluate how well reviewers or action editors understand issues related to systemic racism and diversity science. Within the editorial process, authors can be seen as consumers and thus authors could rate reviews on their helpfulness, timeliness, and usefulness. This would provide a mechanism for all authors (and allow BIPOC authors, in particular) to evaluate how well reviewers understand the diversity science content of manuscripts, as well as inform editors of the appropriateness of the reviews received. Understanding how the review process can be improved and where it works well can help editors and publishers serve the needs of readers and authors. It also would provide data on reviewers and the frequency of racism

---

<sup>3</sup> In 2013, 89% of U.S. born Hispanics/Latinx spoke English proficiently (Krogstad, Stepler, & Lopez, 2015) and 34% of Hispanics/Latinx born outside the U.S. speak English proficiently due to English language requirements in educational systems of Spanish-speaking countries (Krogstad et al., 2015).

within reviews, while offering a way for journals to set benchmarks for improvement of the review process (see Table 2).

This recommendation has several implications. First, if feedback is shared in a de-identified, aggregate manner, it will provide helpful feedback to reviewers. Second, this information will assist editors in knowing who best to request reviews from when soliciting feedback on studies examining BIPOC samples. Third, it will empower authors to be more involved in the editorial process and increase the likelihood that authors get feedback that is most helpful and useful. Such efforts could enhance retention among scientists who work with BIPOC samples.

**14. Address discriminatory and biased feedback within the review process.** Authors, reviewers, or editors sometimes include explicit discriminatory claims or “microaggressions” that invalidate scientists’ professional expertise, theoretical innovation, lived experience, or importance of their contributions. The consequences of such behavior are tragic to any scholar, but may be especially damaging when they occur to a BIPOC student or early career scholar who then justifiably feels unwelcome, misunderstood, and outright rejected by their peers.

There are numerous examples from our own experiences that illustrate these processes; the one offered here may help illustrate behaviors that reflect white supremacy in psychological science, and likely contribute to the disproportionately low representation of BIPOC scientists in psychology. This example from co-author (MJP) involves a BIPOC student first-author whose manuscript examined stressful experiences within an Indigenous sample. The introduction of the paper discussed historical traumas (i.e., forced removal from homelands, legal prohibitions to engage in spiritual practices) that are relevant to systemic disadvantages and disparities within the indigenous community today. A reviewer remarked that these historic traumas are “irrelevant,” “unrelated to the study” and reflected “very old issue(s).” Yet, what this reviewer did not consider is that these precise issues continue to affect the conditions under which many Native American communities endure today. Such comments

reflect an indifference towards systemic racism and are dismissive of the mistreatment and genocide of indigenous peoples. The action editor did not address this reviewer's comments, did not provide guidance on how the authors should address the comments, nor to our knowledge, offer the reviewer helpful resources to assist with understanding the context in order to improve future reviews. Notably, the student author was personally offended by the reviewer's comments, questioned the field's openness to research on Native American populations, and questioned whether knowledgeable reviewers with sufficient expertise in BIPOC populations would ever review her work. Such experiences contribute to maintaining white supremacy in psychological science and deter BIPOC scientists from joining and remaining in our field. Thus, it is recommended that editors evaluate reviews. Further, action editors should also receive training on best practices for responding to reviewers when comments are made that are discriminatory or reinforce white supremacy. Preventing harmful reviewer feedback from deterring research on BIPOC populations is a necessary strategy to recruit and retain BIPOC scientists in psychological science.

**15. Increase the number of BIPOC journal reviewers and editors.** Concepts such as no taxation without representation and being judged by a jury of one's peers are based on a foundational belief that those subject to laws and policies--and standards of a field--should see themselves reflected in those creating the laws, policies, and standards. We argue that this is no less true in psychological science and in the peer review process. BIPOC scholars occupy social positions that provide them with life experiences, perspectives, and values that influence their epistemic values, research topics and populations of interest (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Gonzales, 2018). Appropriate evaluation of their work requires that evaluators are representative of BIPOC groups so they may be judged by peers with similar understanding of the context in which the scholarship originated.

Representation in the review and editorial process impacts the outcome of submitted manuscripts. Roberts and colleagues (2020) queried over 26,000 empirical psychology publications

published in top-tier psychology journals between 1974-2018 and found that only 5% focused on race (ranging from less than 1% in cognitive psychology and a high of 8% in developmental psychology).

When the editors of these journals were White, the proportion of such articles dropped precipitously to less than 4%, but under BIPOC editors, the number of published studies examining race nearly tripled (11%). To create equity in publication outcomes, peer reviewers and editors at all levels must include members from BIPOC communities in sufficient numbers (publicly documented; see Table 2) for them to have influence in decision-making. Current practices involving “desk-rejection” of papers (i.e., preemptively rejecting a manuscript for poor fit to the journal aims, or for failure to meet specific journal standards, without soliciting peer review) on BIPOC populations because of insufficient reviewer expertise is unacceptable, and maintains systemic racism. Journals could hold themselves accountable to increasing the diversity of their editorial board by publishing pictures (in addition to names) of their editorial board on their website.

**16. Include BIPOC community experts on editorial advisory boards.** Community-based partnerships have been shown to improve research quality, practice, implementation in real-world settings, and effectiveness in creating equitable changes in power structures (Michener et al., 2012). Partnerships with community members strengthen research protocols, ask questions with greater relevance to impacted communities and illuminate common research oversights (Hardy et al., 2016; Hiratsuka et al., 2020). Given their benefit to research processes, community members from BIPOC communities should also be involved in the evaluation of research for publication given their expertise and lived experiences directly related to research findings. Publishers must extend beyond traditional academic networks to fill editorial advisory boards and ensure BIPOC community members are included on their advisory boards. This will allow community members to provide feedback to editors, reviewers, and researchers about bias and how it impacts their community and to have voice regarding needed and relevant research for these communities. There may be creative ways for community members to participate in

the review process - if not in a critique on theories or methods, then perhaps for comments that may guide the discussion and conclusions reached from research studies. Note that those with lived experience similarly have been asked to comment and consult on research studies in other professional activities (i.e., within conference symposia led by scientists) and opportunities to consider this input in the review process as advisory to action editors may strengthen the work conducted with BIPOC populations.

**17. Provide diversity, equity, and inclusion-related training to the entire editorial team.** Unlearning biases is an ongoing process that requires intentional action. Training in multiculturalism science among all involved within the peer review process is required and long overdue to ensure that all members have similar knowledge and expectations regarding diversity, equity and inclusion. All editors, associate editors, and reviewers should participate in ongoing training on topics such as, explicit and implicit bias, the importance of soliciting and valuing BIPOC reviewers' comments, understanding current needs and gaps in diversity science literature, confronting one's own biases, how to reconcile evidence that may conflict with one's own feelings. Training may be scaffolded over time to gradually expand editors' and editorial board members' biases.

**18. Mentor BIPOC scholars to engage in editing/reviewing as a vital professional service.** High impact journals (especially) have few BIPOC reviewers available to serve (Hartman et al., 2013), contributing to disparate opportunities for publication (i.e., epistemic exclusion; Dotson, 2012; Settles, Jones et al, 2020). Educators can significantly affect this issue by mentoring scholars to see journal reviewing as an essential service not only to promote research careers, but to reduce white supremacy in psychological science. This may occur through the use of mentored (or team-based) reviews at the individual lab level, through journal-based mentored review programs (see the *Journal of Pediatric Psychology* as an example), or by establishing formal mentorship programs within professional societies to cultivate the development of future BIPOC Associate Editors and Editors. Note that such programs may be especially

useful to offer professional development regarding the editorial process while also providing support for the myriad of biases faced by BIPOC reviewers and editors (see the National Science Foundation ADVANCE Scholars Programs; Carter-Sowell, et al., 2019 as an example). Investigators should seek opportunities to include BIPOC trainees into the review process to address this systemic issue. Similarly, when journals invite BIPOC scholars to serve as guest editors for a special issue (or to co-edit with a senior scholar) this can serve as a vital training opportunity.

**19. Recognize the contributions of BIPOC editorial board members.** Serving on editorial boards and reviewing manuscripts for a journal is a vital service for the advancement of science. Positive reinforcement can be an important tool for engaging and retaining new BIPOC scholars in the editorial process. Various agencies such as the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine or the Ford Foundation, write personalized letters identifying the service contributions and impact on the field and send the letters to those evaluating the scholar (e.g., department chair, dean, P&T committee). These letters serve to recognize and reward individuals for their national service contributions. Similarly, recognizing the contributions of BIPOC editorial board members may be especially vital. Indeed, research shows that a disproportionate majority of BIPOC psychologists pursue clinically-oriented jobs (Becker, 2019), requiring additional steps to engage the few BIPOC scholars in the review process.

**20. Invite BIPOC scholars to present counter commentary.** When manuscripts with the potential to reinforce white supremacy or to disparage certain members of the population in which BIPOC communities are systematically overrepresented (e.g., individuals from low-income communities) are considered for publication, there is an opportunity to remain complicit, or to dismantle white supremacy by invite BIPOC scholars to publish a commentary. Commentaries offer opportunities to educate the field on new ways to reconsider data, provide a forum to introduce alternate theories or perspectives, challenge aspects of the article, extend the position the author has taken, connect the research to the experiences of diverse cultures, and elevate the voices of BIPOC scholars (see Buchanan & Wiklund,

2020b). Sadly, commentaries rarely are requested from BIPOC scholars. In contrast, there are numerous examples of manuscripts published by White authors that disparage BIPOC communities or diversity science, with no opportunity for BIPOC scholars to comment on the science (Fairchild, 2000).

**21. Track rejection rates for manuscripts with predominantly BIPOC samples.** Due to epistemic exclusion, “mainstream” journals often relegate papers on BIPOC publications to journals on “special populations” or research dedicated exclusively to non-White populations thereby publishing more on White samples (Roberts et al., 2020). Indeed, the impact factor for most “specialty” journals is significantly lower than for journals that allow predominantly White samples, significantly affecting opportunities for scientific impact, hiring tenure, and promotion. Journal editors have an opportunity to elevate, or perhaps inadvertently to systematically exclude papers from publication. It is recommended that journal editors record the topics and population of papers that are rejected, either with or without peer review, and report these data annually for accountability, and so that researchers know which outlets may be receptive to psychological science from BIPOC perspectives and so publishers can determine if systematic exclusion of BIPOC work is occurring and at what level.

**22. Educate authors to educate the field about race.** Most scientists learn to “market” their research to increase its applicability, impact, and to emphasize its need. For psychological science conducted by BIPOC scholars, or related to psychological processes relevant within BIPOC populations, these marketing skills are more complex for several reasons. First, investigators need to not only highlight research as understudied and important, but to also skillfully critique why prior research conducted by White authors or on White populations may not be applicable. This is a challenging task given inherent differences in power between White and BIPOC investigators within the field. Second, the marginalization of prior work on BIPOC populations (i.e., within “specialty” journals) not as frequently read by White investigators, and the paucity of BIPOC scholars in the field, leaves few qualified experts available to evaluate research on BIPOC populations. Therefore, scholars must provide substantial

didactic material to explain the significance of research being conducted. Last, it is important to recognize that these added burdens require manuscript preparation skills that rarely are discussed or taught in most doctoral programs. Consequently, it is recommended that training programs for psychological scientists explicitly discuss and train students to explain how studies on BIPOC populations contribute to the literature, to educate readers and reviewers about important biases in prior work, and to skillfully rebut comments in the editorial process that may maintain white supremacy or unfairly penalize research on BIPOC populations or by BIPOC investigators.

### **How Science is Disseminated**

Priorities for disseminating research findings reflect the pervasiveness of racism and white supremacy in psychological science. Research findings should benefit the broader public, which requires dissemination for public audiences and to BIPOC communities specifically. Health and psychological science investigators have a lengthy history of exploiting BIPOC communities and must counter this history by, at a minimum, disseminating research in ways that reach beyond a journal's readership. In this section, we discuss changes to research dissemination practices that serve to upend racism and white supremacy in psychological science.

**23. Report and reward community-based dissemination.** When scholars submit their work to academic journals public dissemination efforts are penalized because, when archived online, community presentations and non-academic publications are flagged as plagiarism and originality algorithms that at best, suggest a diminished novelty of the work, and at worst imply scholars plagiarized their work. This creates systemic biases that reduce the chances that research with BIPOC populations, particularly when community based, will be accepted and recognized as novel contributions to the field. To reverse this trend, journals should celebrate CBPR partnerships and broader dissemination efforts by stating that research disseminated for public and community audiences is welcomed as novel for academic

publications and ensure that originality indices are adjusted so authors are not penalized for their community dissemination efforts.

**24. Create public-focused dissemination strategies that extend findings to BIPOC communities.**

Journals should join the growing trend wherein scientific contributions are not measured by citations within the scientific literature alone, but instead embrace direct dissemination to communities and to the public (e.g., using Altmetrics) as markers of impact of the work. Dissemination to BIPOC communities can and should come in many formats, such as practice-oriented journals that provide easily digestible research findings and have clear implications for communities that psychologists serve. Further, social media and newsletters that actively disseminate research to communities that can benefit from them should be championed. Research briefings that are tailored for policy makers and health officials should be encouraged. Infographics that are inclusive and relevant to BIPOC communities, podcasts that reach diverse audiences, and emerging formats that extend the reach of our science should be encouraged by journals. Publishers should ensure they have dedicated staff with specialized skill sets to broadly disseminate scientific findings across a variety of platforms that are broadly accessible, easily understood, and relevant to BIPOC communities.

**25. Collaborate with community partners for dissemination.** One of the principles of CBPR involves collaborating with community partners at all stages of the research process (Israel et al, 2010), including the dissemination of research findings. Scientists are notoriously poor at sharing science with the public. Thus, community partners should be an integral part of decision-making when mapping out the dissemination plan of action. When BIPOC community partners are involved in all stages of the research process, they can readily share knowledge, resources, and expertise about how, where, and to whom findings should be disseminated in order to have the biggest and most meaningful impact. Working together as co-authors to produce articles in scientific and non-scientific outlets will allow publications to be written and presented in more palatable ways and will move research into the hands and minds of

the public. When community partners are co-authors dissemination to the communities impacted by our research will occur more seamlessly and naturally.

### **Conclusion**

Today we have an opportunity to make substantial changes in psychological science to dismantle white supremacy and end epistemic oppression. The multiple calamities of 2020, including the COVID-19 global pandemic and increased national attention to the plague of racism throughout the United States, have inspired many organizations, universities, and individual scholars to make statements in solidarity with the Black Lives Matter movement. However, these statements require concrete action. This paper has offered 25 areas where action may be taken to change how research is conducted, reported, reviewed, and disseminated. Each of these areas includes specific recommendations for authors, educators, journal editors/publishers, and/or reviewers.

Commitment to these actions would be facilitated by steps to ensure accountability. To assist in this process, this paper also offers a sample *diversity accountability index for journals* (DAI-J; see Table 2) that converts these recommendations and those made by others (Roberts et al., 2020) into quantifiable progress indicators. There are numerous ways the DAI could be used to benefit psychological science, and may be easily adapted to individual communities and cultures. For instance, measuring journals' progress on each of the metrics suggested herein (see Table 2, including a suggested scoring system) can assist editors in measuring anti-racist work; scores might be publicly posted to signal journals' commitment to actions that reduce white supremacy, and even could encourage more submissions from authors by signaling outlets that are likely to be "safe spaces" for submissions by BIPOC scholars or on topics relevant to BIPOC populations. We believe these steps are necessary to monitor progress toward goals, resulting in more equitable scientific processes. Indeed, these data may be published in future analyses of psychological science (perhaps even as compared to other scientific disciplines) to demonstrate our progress within psychological sub-disciplines, or as a field more broadly. It is our hope

that changes such as these, not in isolation, but conjointly to affect the entire system in which psychological science occurs, will help address systemic racism that has been complicitly maintained for far too long.

### References

- Becker, C. B. (2019). Can we do better? Addressing structural barriers to increasing diversity in clinical psychology. *Clinical Science Newsletter*, 23(3), 2-4.
- Bernal, D. D. & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 169–180.  
<https://doi-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/10.1080/713845282>
- Buchanan, N. T. & Settles, I. H. (2019). Managing (in)visibility and hypervisibility at work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.11.001>
- Buchanan, N. T. & Wiklund, L. (2020a). Why clinical science must change or die: Integrating intersectionality and social justice. *Women & Therapy*, 34(3-4), 309-329.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02703149.2020.1729470>
- Buchanan, N. T. & Wiklund, L. (2020b). Intersectionality research in psychological science: Resisting the tendency to disconnect, dilute, and depoliticize. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Carter-Sowell, A. R., Vaid, J., Stanley, C. A., Pettit, B., & Battle, J. S. (2019). ADVANCE Scholar Program: Enhancing minoritized scholars' professional visibility. *Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 38(3), 305-327. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-03-2018-0059>
- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American psychologist*, 64(3), 170.
- DeJesus, J. M., Callanan, M. A., Solis, G., & Gelman, S. A. (2019). Generic language in scientific communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(37), 18370-18377.
- Diaz, I., & Bergman, M. E. (2013). It's not us, it's you: Why isn't research on minority workers appearing in our "top-tier" journals?. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6(1), 70-75.

- Dotson, K. (2012). A cautionary tale: On limiting epistemic oppression. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 33(1), 24-47.
- Dotson, K. (2014). Conceptualizing epistemic oppression. *Social Epistemology*, 28(2), 115-138.
- Fairchild, H. H. (2000). African American psychology. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology* (pp. 92–99). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Discusses how most research on African Americans is from a deficit perspective which perpetuates negative stereotypes.
- Ford, C. L., & Harawa, N. T. (2010). A new conceptualization of ethnicity for social epidemiologic and health equity research. *Social science & medicine*, 71(2), 251-258.
- Gonzales, L. D. (2018). Subverting and minding boundaries: The intellectual work of women. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 89(5), 677–701. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/10.1080/00221546.2018.1434278>
- Hall, G. C. N., Ibaraki, A. Y., Huang, E. R., Marti, C. N., & Stice, E. (2016). A meta-analysis of cultural adaptations of psychological interventions. *Behavior Therapy*, 47(6), 993-1014.
- Hardy, L. J., Hughes, A., Hulen, E., Figueroa, A., Evans, C., & Begay, R. C. (2016). Hiring the experts: best practices for community-engaged research. *Qualitative Research*, 16(5), 592-600. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794115579474>
- Held, B. S. (2020). Epistemic violence in psychological science: Can knowledge of, from, and for the (othered) people solve the problem? *Theory & Psychology*, 30(3), 349–370. <https://doi-org.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/10.1177/0959354319883943>
- Helms, J. E. (2020). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a white person or understanding the white persons in your life*. Cognella.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, 466(7302), 29-29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a>

Hiratsuka, V. Y., Trinidad, S. B., Ludman, E. J., Shaw, J. L., Burke, W., Robinson, R. F., & Dillard, D. A.

(2020). " You Actually View Us as the Experts in Our Own System": Indigenous–Academic Community Partnership. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 14(2), 187-195. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2020.0018>

Hoppe, T. A., Litovitz, A., Willis, K. A., Meseroll, R. A., Perkins, M. J., Hutchins, B. I., ... & Santangelo, G. M.

(2019). Topic choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH awards to African-American/black scientists. *Science advances*, 5(10), eaaw7238.

Howard, M. C., & Hoffman, M. E. (2018). Variable-centered, person-centered, and person-specific

approaches: where theory meets the method. *Organizational Research Methods*, 21(4), 846-876.

Israel, B. A., Coombe, C. M., Cheezum, R. R., Schulz, A. J., McGranaghan, R. J., Lichtenstein, R., Reyes, A.

G., Clement, J., & Burris, A. (2010). Community-based participatory research: a capacity-building approach for policy advocacy aimed at eliminating health disparities. *American journal of public health*, 100(11), 2094–2102. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.170506>

Krogstad, J. M., Stepler, R., & Lopez, M. H. (2015). English proficiency on the rise among Latinos: U.S.

born driving language changes. Pew Research Center, Washington D.C., May. Accessed on

November 1, 2020 at <https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2015/05/12/english-proficiency-on-the-rise-among-latinos>

Lee, C. J., Sugimoto, C. R., Zhang, G., Cronin, B. (2013). Bias in peer review. *Advances in Information*

*Science*, 64(1), 2-17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22784>

Mahoney, M. J. (1977). Publication prejudices: An experimental study of confirmatory bias in the peer

review system. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 1(2), 161-175.

Miller, A. L., Stern, C., & Neville, H. (2019). Forging diversity-science-informed guidelines for research on

race and racism in psychological science. *Journal of Social Issues* 75(4), 1240-1261.

Michener, L., Cook, J., Ahmed, S. M., Yonas, M. A., Coyne-Beasley, T., & Aguilar-Gaxiola, S. (2012).

Aligning the goals of community-engaged research: why and how academic health centers can successfully engage with communities to improve health. *Academic Medicine*, 87(3), 285-291. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0b013e3182441680

Neblett, Jr., E.W. (2019). Diversity (psychological) science training: challenges, tensions, and a call to action. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(4), 1216-1239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12357>

O'Reilly, M. (2020, June 5). Systems Centered Language: Speaking truth to power during COVID-19 while confronting racism. *Medium*. <https://medium.com/@meagoreillyphd/systems-centered-language-a3dc7951570e>

Osbeck, L. (2018). *Values in psychological science: Re-imagining epistemic priorities at a new frontier*.

Cambridge University Press. Plaut, V. C. (2010a). Diversity science: Why and how difference makes a difference. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(2), 77-99.

Plaut, V. C. (2010b). Diversity science: Who needs it?. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(2), 168-174.

Proctor, J. (2020). <https://www.saytheirnamesmemorials.com/press>. Accessed on November 19, 2020

Roberts, D. (2011). *Fatal Invention: How Science, Politics, and Big Business Re-create Race in the Twenty-first Century*. New Press/ORIM.

Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 1745691620927709.

Rosenthal, L. (2016). Incorporating intersectionality into psychology: An opportunity to promote social justice and equity. *American Psychologist*, 71(6), 474.

Salter, P. S., Adams, G., & Perez, M. J. (2018). Racism in the structure of everyday worlds: A cultural-psychological perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 150-155.

- Settles, I. H., Jones, M. K., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2020). Epistemic exclusion: Scholar(ly) devaluation that marginalizes Faculty of Color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. *Advance online publication*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000174>
- Settles, I. H., Warner, L., Buchanan, N. T., & Jones, M. K. (2020). Understanding Psychology's Resistance to Intersectionality Theory using a Framework of Invisibility and Epistemic Exclusion. *Journal of Social Issues*. *Advance online publication*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josi.12403>
- Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American psychologist*, *60*(1), 16.
- Stanley, C. A. (2007). When counter narratives meet master narratives in the journal editorial-review process. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(1), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X06298008>
- Sue, D. W., & Torino, G. C. (2005). Racial-cultural competence: Awareness, knowledge, and skills. In R. T. Carter (Ed.), *Handbook of racial-cultural psychology and counseling: Training and practice* (Vol. 2, pp. 3–18). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Suyemoto, K. L., Erisman, S. M., Holowka, D.W., Fuchs, C., Barrett-Model, H., Ng, F., Liu, C., Chandler, D., Hazeltine, K. & Roemer, L. (2016). UMass Boston comprehensive demographic questionnaire, revised. As cited in Wadsworth, L. P., Morgan, L. P., Hayes-Skelton, S. A., Roemer, L., & Suyemoto, K. L. Ways to boost your research rigor through increasing your cultural competence. *The Behavior Therapist*, *39*, 83-89.
- Teo, T. (2008). From speculation to epistemological violence in psychology: A critical-hermeneutic reconstruction. *Theory & Psychology*, *18*, 47–67. doi: [10.1177/0959354307086922](https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354307086922)
- Teo, T. (2018). *Outline of theoretical psychology: Critical investigations*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Valrie, C., Thurston, I., & Santos, M. (2020). Introduction to the Special Issue: Addressing Health Disparities in Pediatric Psychology. *Journal of Pediatric psychology*, *45*(8), 833-838.

Table 1. Summary of Recommendations and Action Steps for Authors (A), Educators (E), Journals (J), and Reviewers (R)

Recommendation	Action Steps	Stakeholders			
<b>How science is conducted</b>					
1. Conduct and publish more papers on race	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Conduct more research and teach on diversity science theories and frameworks.</li> <li>-Encourage research and papers on diversity (e.g., special issues).</li> <li>-Require authors to address applications of work to non-White populations and social inequality.</li> </ul>	A	E		
			E	J	
				J	R
2. Exemplify values regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Conduct research on the full spectrum of a BIPOC population (e.g., not only low-income members).</li> <li>-Publish BIPOC research from a strength-based, not just a deficit, perspective (e.g., resiliency).</li> <li>-Include language that reflect values related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in journal mission statements.</li> <li>-Showcase papers that are relevant to BIPOC populations.</li> <li>-Express value in publishing BIPOC related manuscripts (e.g., training editorial staff on these priorities and highlighting this expectation in directions for reviewers).</li> <li>-Encourage authors to include positionality statements and include author photos (see <i>American Psychologist</i> for examples).</li> <li>-Exclude references from page and word limitations to encourage inclusion of BIPOC scholars and BIPOC-related publications.</li> </ul>	A			
		A			
				J	
				J	
				J	
		A		J	
				J	
3. Use research methods most appropriate for BIPOC populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Use community-based participatory research (CBPR) principles.</li> <li>-Train students on CBPR.</li> <li>-Encourage research that uses CBPR and person-centered analyses that may better capture heterogeneity in diverse samples.</li> <li>-Increase openness to CBPR and person-centered analyses.</li> </ul>	A			
			E		
				J	
				J	R
4. Encourage the recruitment of more diverse samples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-When using subject pool samples, collaborate with community colleges with diverse students.</li> <li>-Establish community partnerships with BIPOC organizations to increase diverse samples.</li> <li>-Consider demographic characteristics of the United States, and report how research samples compare to national statistics.</li> <li>-Highlight the importance of recruiting diverse samples is graduate-level research methods courses.</li> <li>-Expand journal submission classifications to include diversity science as a primary manuscript type.</li> <li>-Require discussion of the lack of diversity in studies with predominantly White participants.</li> </ul>	A	E		
		A	E		
		A	E	J	R
				J	
				J	R
5. Promote the use of diversity science research approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Conduct more research from a diversity science perspective.</li> <li>-Train students on diversity science theory and how this can expand theory-informed research and evidence-based practice.</li> <li>-Include research on diversity science in the list of accepted topics in journal mission statements.</li> <li>-Expand submission classifications to include diversity science.</li> <li>-Incentivize authors that submit research using diversity science approaches.</li> </ul>	A			
		A	E		
				J	
				J	
				J	R
<b>How science is reported</b>					
6. Require the use of system centered language (SCL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Frame results within the systemic structures that maintain disparate outcomes when interpreting findings.</li> <li>-Train students on SCL and have them practice writing in this manner.</li> <li>-Update author guidelines to require the use of SCL in all submissions.</li> <li>-Indicate the percentage of publications that use SCL in journal's yearly reporting standards.</li> <li>-Train reviewers and editors on use of SCL.</li> <li>-Require authors to attest that they used SCL in manuscript submission portals.</li> <li>-Add SCL to the next revision of the APA Publication Manual</li> </ul>	A	E	J	R
		A	E		
				J	
				J	
				J	R
				J	
				J	

	-Review manuscripts for person-first language and SCL.	A	E	J	R
7. Update journal keywords to be more inclusive	-Use specific and relevant keywords to describe the nuances in their diversity science research. -Increase the pool of diversity-related keywords to include racism, structural inequality, cultural humility, implicit bias, discrimination, ethnic identity, racial identity, and include an “other” field for missing terms. -Update keywords regularly to remain current with the evolving language used in diversity science (e.g., BIPOC).	A			J
8. Define race and ethnicity contextually and conceptually	-Acknowledge the sociopolitical nature of race/ethnicity. -Train students to define race and ethnicity contextually and conceptually. -Require authors provide race data for all participants. -Require discussion sections include how the race and context of the sample may impact findings. -Evaluate manuscripts for clear definitions of race and context for their sample.	A	E	J	
9. Require reporting of ethnicity for all participants	-Require ethnicity be reported for all participants to reflect the richness of ethnicities within groups. -Describe how ethnicity was determined and if participants could endorse multiple identities. -Consider the ways in which ethnicity is dynamic as a function of context, place, and time when describing ethnicity. -Train students on the diverse ways one can assess ethnicity and the importance of considering context. -Require the reporting of ethnicities for ALL races in the next version of the APA Publication Manual. -Require authors discuss it as a limitation if they do not provide ethnicity data for all participants or had inadequate assessments of ethnicity.	A	E	J	R
10. Report heterogeneity within BIPOC populations	-Require all relevant participant demographics and intersecting identities be reported. -Examine if findings are similar or different across demographic groups when possible. -Limit discussion of study generalizability to those demographic groups appropriately represented among study participants. -Train students to report all relevant participant demographics including intersecting identities.	A	E	J	R

**How science is reviewed**

11. Establish systems to examine inequities in reviews and their impact on BIPOC research	-Monitor current practices for detecting biases and identify areas for improvement. -Set benchmarks, review progress annually and report progress on these goals publicly. -Establish protocols for responding to biased reviewer comments. -Have editors give feedback to reviewers about biased comments and request they are revised before sending to authors.				J
12. Implement changes at the top that address ongoing racism in the review process	-Consider a candidate's abilities and track record in creating equitable environment when vetting editors (e.g., require candidates to submit diversity statements). -Examining existing journal leadership develop procedures that promote equitable practices in leadership selection. -Evaluate journals on metrics related to BIPOC presence in authorship, editorial membership, and content (see Table 2).				J
13. Create a system for authors to rate reviews and reviewers	-Have authors rate the review process for a journal in terms of helpfulness, timeliness, and usefulness. -Report biased statements from authors or reviewers. -Evaluate reviewers on their understanding of race, culture, and knowledge of diversity science. -Create a formal mechanism for authors to report biased statements. -Train students on how to report or provide feedback to editors when reviews include biased statements. -Have authors report on a reviewer's understanding of racial, cultural and diversity science topics related to their manuscript. -Provide summary data about biased reviews from author feedback forms to reviewers and set benchmarks for improvement. -Be open to receiving feedback on biased statements.	A			J
		A			J
		A			J
			E		J
					J
		A	E	J	R

14. Address discrimination within the review process	-Seek training to learn how to best respond to authors or reviewers make biased comments. -Create processes and protocols to address racism in the editorial and research process.	A	E	J	R
15. Increase the number of BIPOC journal reviewers/editors	-Train students on how to review manuscripts and provide constructive feedback. -Assess the proportion of BIPOC reviewers and editors utilized by the journal and establish a 5-year plan to increase their representation in these roles.		E	J	J
16. Include BIPOC community experts on editorial advisory boards	-Ensure BIPOC community members are included on journal advisory boards. -Consider creative ways for community members to participate in the review process (e.g., comment on discussion and conclusions reached from research studies).			J	J
17. Provide DEI training to the entire editorial team	-Participate in diversity, equity, and inclusion-related training -Provide training for the entire editorial team on diversity, equity, and inclusion.	A	E	J	R
18. Mentor BIPOC scholars to engage in editing/reviewing as a vital professional service	-Mentor scholars on reviewing as an essential service that promotes research careers and reduce research inequities. -Encourage and provide team-based reviews as professional development opportunities. -Provide journal-based mentoring review programs. -Establish formal mentorship programs within professional societies to cultivate the development of future BIPOC editors.	A	E	J	R
19. Recognize the contributions of BIPOC editorial members	-Provide letters that recognize and reward BIPOC individuals for their national service contributions. -Submit letters that recognize journal reviewing to promotion and tenure committees or annual evaluations.	A		J	J
20. Invite BIPOC scholars to present commentary	-Request commentaries from BIPOC scholars, particularly when a manuscript might reinforce white supremacy or disparage BIPOC communities.			J	J
21. Track rejection rates for papers with BIPOC samples & foci	-Track desk reject papers. -Track reviewed paper rejections (e.g., timeline to return reviews, rejections because reviewers were not identified).			J	J
22. Educate authors to educate the field about race	-Train students/scholars to proactively challenge and rebut common biases about BIPOC scholarship and promote the significance of BIPOC research. -Train students to value and describe how studies of BIPOC populations contribute to the literature in the field. -Educate readers and reviewers to skillfully rebut biased comments in the editorial process.	A	E	E	E
<b>How Science is Disseminated</b>					
23. Report/reward community-based dissemination	-Ensure originality index scores are adjusted so authors are not penalized for community dissemination efforts prior to publication.			J	J
24. Create public-focused dissemination strategies that extend to BIPOC communities	-Disseminate research findings in a variety of formats relevant to BIPOC communities (e.g., practice-oriented journals, social media, infographics, podcasts, and emerging formats) to extend the reach of our science. -Ensure there are dedicated staff members with the specialized skills needed to broadly disseminate scientific findings across a variety of platforms that are broadly accessible, easily understood, and relevant to BIPOC communities.			J	J
25. Collaborate with community partners for dissemination	-Work together with community partners to disseminate findings in scientific and non-scientific outlets.	A	E		

*Note.* A = Authors, E = Educators, J = Journal editors and publishers, R = Reviewers.

Table 2. The Diversity Accountability Index for Journals (DAI-J) in Psychological Science

Index Topic	2 = Yes	1 = Partial	0 = No
<b>1. Publications focused on race, ethnicity, racism, and diversity science</b>	Over 33% of publications addressed any of these topics, over 33% explored the underlying factors driving these relationships and examine nuanced differences within BIPOC groups.	20-30% of publications addressed any of these topics, but only 0-10% addressed the underlying factors driving these relationships or examined nuanced differences within BIPOC groups	0-10% of publications addressed any of these topics
<b>2. Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) principles</b>	Mission statement reflects DEI principles; showcases work relevant to BIPOC populations; over 33% of publications include author positionality statements	Mission statement reflects DEI principles, but positionality statements of social identity are not included	Mission statement does not reflect any DEI principles or positionality statements
<b>3. Inclusive research methods</b>	Over 33% of publications use inclusive research methods and examine BIPOC within group heterogeneity	20-30% of publications use inclusive research methods and examine BIPOC within group heterogeneity	0-10% of publications use inclusive research methods
<b>4. Recruitment of diverse samples</b>	Journal requires authors to provide explicit statements regarding sample diversity and justification of use of WEIRD and all White samples, and reviewers are required to assess for sample inclusion concerns	Journal requires 1 or 2, but not all of the following: explicit statements regarding sample diversity; justification of WEIRD or all White samples; reviewers to assess for sample inclusion concerns	Journal does not require any of the following: explicit statements regarding sample diversity, justification of WEIRD and all White samples; reviewers to assess for sample inclusion
<b>5. Use of Diversity Science Approaches</b>	Diversity science approaches are encouraged and used in over 33% of published papers	Diversity science approaches are encouraged and used in 20-30% of published papers	Diversity science approaches are not encouraged and are used in 0-10% of published papers
<b>6. Systems Centered Language (SCL)</b>	Author instructions encourage SCL and over 33% of published papers use SCL	Author instructions encourage SCL and 20-30% of published papers use SCL	SCL is not explicitly encouraged and 0-10% of papers use SCL
<b>7. Inclusive journal keywords<sup>4</sup></b>	Over 20% of journal keywords are inclusive and the percentage of articles using these inclusive keywords are published each year along with benchmarks to increase use	Over 20% of journal keywords are inclusive but the percentage of articles using these inclusive keywords and benchmarks to increase use are not published yearly	Less than 10% of journal keywords are inclusive; percentage of articles using such keywords is not published
<b>8. Definitions of race</b>	Most articles discussing race define the construct and explain how it was measured and used	Some articles discussing race define the construct and explain how it was measured and used	Few articles discussing race define the construct or explain how it is was measured and used
<b>9. Ethnicity reporting for participants of all races</b>	Most articles reported ethnicity for participants of all races	Some articles reported ethnicity for participants of all races	Few articles reported ethnicity for participants of all races
<b>10. Within group heterogeneity</b>	Most articles report three or more sociodemographic identities and at least 33% of articles examine findings by intersecting identities	Some articles report three or more sociodemographic identities and 20-30% of articles examine findings by intersecting identities	Few articles report three or more sociodemographic identities and 0-10% of articles examine findings by intersecting identities

<sup>4</sup> Examples of inclusive BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color)-related keywords include racial justice, racism, intersectionality theory, oppression, minority stress, sexism, structural inequality, cultural humility, implicit bias, discrimination, ethnic identity, racial identity, health equity, diversity, and inclusion.

<b>11. Systems to identify and respond to bias in reviews</b>	Established a system to recognize bias in the review process and protocols to respond to bias in reviews	Has established either a system to recognize bias in the review process or protocols to respond to bias in reviews	No system for recognizing bias in review process and no protocols to respond to bias in reviews
<b>12. Initiatives to dismantle white supremacy</b>	Journal has publicly disseminated initiatives to dismantle white supremacy in psychological science	Journal has initiatives to dismantle white supremacy in psychological science but initiatives are not publicly disseminated	Journal has no initiatives to dismantle white supremacy in psychological science
<b>13. System to rate reviews and reviewers</b>	There is a formal system for authors to provide feedback on reviews; feedback is used to identify bias toward BIPOC scholarship in the review process	There is a formal system for authors to provide feedback on reviews but feedback is not used to identify areas of bias in the review process	There is no formal system for authors to provide feedback on reviews
<b>14. System to address discriminatory and biased feedback</b>	The frequency of discriminatory and biased feedback in reviews is published each year and benchmarks are set to reduce their occurrence	The frequency of discriminatory and biased feedback in reviews is published but there are no listed benchmarks to reduce their occurrence	The frequency of discriminatory and biased feedback in reviews is not published and there are no benchmarks set to reduce their occurrence
<b>15. BIPOC reviewers, editors, and authors</b>	Number of BIPOC reviewers and editors are assessed and reported annually; over 25% of reviewers and editors self-identify as BIPOC; and over 25% of publications include BIPOC authors	Number of BIPOC reviewers and editors are not assessed and reported; fewer than 25% of reviewers, editors, and authors are BIPOC	Number of BIPOC reviewers and editors are not assessed and reported and less than 10% of reviewers, editors, and authors are BIPOC
<b>16. Community experts</b>	Community experts are included on the editorial advisory board	Community experts are consulted for feedback on certain papers but not included on editorial advisory board	Community experts are not consulted and not included as members on the editorial advisory board
<b>17. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) training</b>	Editorial board members are required to complete DEI and implicit bias trainings	Editorial board members are encouraged, but not required, to complete DEI and implicit bias trainings	There is no statement or expectation that editorial board members complete DEI and implicit bias trainings
<b>18. BIPOC scholar mentorship</b>	Has programs to mentor BIPOC scholar in both the review and editorial processes	Has programs to mentor BIPOC scholar in either the review or the editorial process (but not both)	No programs to mentor BIPOC scholar in the review/editorial process
<b>19. Recognize BIPOC editorial board members</b>	Contributions of BIPOC editorial members are formally recognized within and outside of the journal	Contributions of BIPOC editorial board members are acknowledged in the journal only	Contributions of BIPOC editorial board members are not formally recognized
<b>20. Invite commentaries to counter racism</b>	Commentaries are solicited for every publication that has the potential to reinforce white supremacy	Commentaries are solicited for some publications that have the potential to reinforce white supremacy	Commentaries are not solicited for publications that have the potential to reinforce white supremacy
<b>21. Assess for bias in rejection rates</b>	Manuscript rejection rates are reported across keywords to assess disparities for BIPOC scholarship and for all manuscripts that did and did not undergo peer review; benchmarks are set for improvement	Manuscript rejection rates are reported across keywords to assess disparities for BIPOC scholarship and for all manuscripts that did and did not undergo peer review; no benchmarks for improvement are set	Manuscript rejection rates across keywords are not examined or reported
<b>22. Educate about race, racism and bias</b>	Support and lead educational and training efforts that raise awareness about the value	Supporting, but not leading, educational and training efforts that raise awareness about the	No support for educational efforts or training programs that raise awareness

	of BIPOC scholarship, bias in prior work, and the need to upend racism in psychological science	value of BIPOC scholarship, bias in prior work, and the need to upend racism in psychological science	about the value of BIPOC scholarship, bias in prior work, and the need to upend racism in psychological science
<b>23. Community dissemination plan</b>	Public and community dissemination is actively encouraged and over 33% of articles include a public dissemination plan targeting BIPOC communities	Public and community dissemination is actively encouraged, but few articles include a public dissemination plan targeting BIPOC communities	Public and community dissemination is not encouraged (or is penalized); no articles include public dissemination plans
<b>24. Public and BIPOC-focused dissemination tracking</b>	The proportion of papers whose findings were directly disseminated to the public and BIPOC communities is tracked and publicly reported annually	The proportion of papers whose findings were directly disseminated to the public and BIPOC communities is tracked but not publicly reported annually	The proportion of papers whose findings were directly disseminated to the public and BIPOC communities is not tracked
<b>25. Dissemination with community partners</b>	Over 33% of papers have community partners as co-authors	20-30% of papers have community co-authors	0-10% of papers have community partners as co-authors

*Note:*

To increase awareness and establish accountability, we propose that journals rate themselves using this emerging list of accountability benchmarks. Journals can release their diversity accountability index score annually to allow their readership to hold them accountable to upending racism in psychological science. Journals can set benchmarks for improvement and review progress on an annual basis. Journals can publicly report on their progress toward addressing their benchmarks. In the present table, “Most” refers to 70-100% of published articles, “Some” refers to 30-50% of published articles, and “Few” refers to 0-10% of published articles.